

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 and 21-29 remain in the application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 21 have been amended. Claims 26-29 have been newly added. Claims 10-20 are cancelled without disclaimer and without prejudice to presentation in a subsequent application.

Applicant believes the amendments don't add new matter. Support for the amendments may be at least found at least with respect to FIGs. 12, 15, 17, 52 and 74-76 and paragraphs 38, 39, 156, 163-168, 176-180, 192 and 195 of US publication no. 20040143496. For example, paragraph 195 recites,

**[0195]** As shown in **FIG. 17**, the awards matched to the patron are then displayed **1756** for system users at one of the user computers **1620** and/or programmable devices **1622**. The patron locator and visualization process **1500** described with reference to **FIG. 15** may be utilized in connection with the list of potential awards so that system users may easily locate a patron and personally offer them an award. In one embodiment scripting that describes how to deliver the award is displayed along with the collection of potential awards. In this way, personnel of the establishment that do not have the experience of executive hosts, for example, are given a list potential awards as well as directions so that they may feel more comfortable and confident when offering an award.

#### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claims subject to the 112 rejection are cancelled.

#### ***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

#### **The Office Communication of October 8, 2008, recites:**

7. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boushy et al. US 6003013 in view of Pierce US 6332126 B.

#### **End of Citation from Office Communication of October 8, 2008.**

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

**The Office Communication of October 8, 2008, recites:**

Boushy discloses several offers based on updated profiles but does not specifically disclose *“based upon at least the historical transaction information involving said patrons including the first patron and the current transaction activity of at least the first patron, sorting the two or more awards according to a likelihood of the first patron accepting each award; and outputting, based upon said sorting, at least one recommendation of an award to offer to the first patron.”*

**End of Citation from Office Communication of October 8, 2008.**

The claims as amended describe limitations, such as recited in claim 1 of, a) “providing a floor diagram of a gaming establishment including a relative position and an arrangement of gaming devices and gaming tables within the gaming establishment;” b) “displaying a first interface on a display device coupled to the server, said first interface comprising a visual indicator of a location of said first patron rendered on the floor diagram of said gaming establishment;” and c) “displaying a second interface on the display device, based upon said sorting, information regarding at least one recommendation of an award to offer to the first patron wherein access to said first interface and said second interface is limited to operators of said gaming establishment.”

The deficiency in Boushy related to the claims from the Office Communication recited above is noted. In addition, the combination of Boushy and Pierce does not teach or suggest “displaying a first interface on a display device coupled to the server, said first interface comprising a visual indicator of a location of said first patron rendered on the floor diagram of said gaming establishment” and “displaying a second interface on the display device, based upon said sorting, information regarding at least one recommendation of an award to offer to the first patron. As an example, this combination of interfaces as recited in paragraph 195 above may allow a system user to easily locate a patron and personally offer them an award. The combination of Boushy and Pierces does not teach or suggest a system with such capabilities. Thus, the combination can’t be said to render the pending claims obvious and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/David P. Olynick/  
David P. Olynick  
Reg. No.: 48,615

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100